

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

Claims 1-15 and 40-60 are pending in the present application. No new matter has been added. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are allowable.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-15, 40, 41 and 43-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over “Linkers and Loaders, chapter 6,” Jon Levine, June 1999 (hereinafter “Levine”). (See 12/31/08 Office Action, pp. 2-8.)

Claim 1 recites “[a] computer readable storage medium including a set of instructions executable by a processor, the set of instructions operable to: receive a software module, the software module including references to locations within the software module, at least some of the references being backward references; and reorder components of the software module into a predetermined order based on a type of the components to remove at least some of the backward references, wherein the components include at least one of a header, a section, and a table, wherein the reordered software module includes the at least some of the backward references, and wherein the at least some of the backward references in the reordered software module are stored in a memory to avoid a nonsequential reading of the reordered software module.”

The Examiner asserts that “*Levine* discloses... reordering components of the software module into a predetermined order based on a type (*i.e.* objects being referenced) of the components to remove at least some of the backward references.” (12/31/08 Office Action, p. 3, citing *Levine*, pp. 5-6.) The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 recites that components

are reordered “into a *predetermined order* based on a *type* of the components.” For example, in the exemplary embodiment of Figures 1-4 of the Specification of the present invention, the predetermined order recited includes a module header 310, a program header table 320, a section header table 330, a section string table 340, an entry point table 350, a text section 360, one or more data sections 370, a symbol string table 380, a symbol table 390, and a relocation information table 395. (See Specification, pp. 5-17, Figs. 1-4.) While other orders may be possible in other exemplary embodiments, one of skill in the art will understand that this order is clearly predetermined and based on the functions of various components, as recited in claim 1. In contrast, Levine describes a method wherein the obtained order is dynamically determined based on symbol references contained within the various components. (See Levine, pp. 5-6, § “Creating libraries”.) The Applicant respectfully submits that no “predetermined order” is disclosed or suggested by Levine, and that the ordering disclosed by Levine is not “based on a type of the components,” and, therefore, Levine does not disclose or suggest “reorder[ing] components of the software module into a predetermined order based on a type of the components,” as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn. Because claims 2-8 and 40, 41 and 43-54 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claim 9 recites “[a] system, comprising: a memory storing a reorder module configured to receive a software module including references to locations within the software module, at least some of the references being backward references, the reorder module configured to reorder components of the software module into a predetermined order based on a type of the components and remove at least some of the backward references, the components including at least one of at least one of a header, a section, and a table; and a processor executing the reorder module, wherein the reordered software module includes the at least some of the backward references, and wherein the at least some of the backward references in the reordered software

module are stored in a memory to avoid a nonsequential reading of the reordered software module.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Levine does not disclose or suggest a “reorder module configured to reorder components of the software module into a predetermined order based on a type of the components,” as recited in claim 9, for the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn. Because claims 10-15 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 9, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claim 55 recites “[a] computer readable storage medium including a set of instructions executable by a processor, the set of instructions operable to: receive a software module, the software module including components arranged in a first order, a first one of the components including a reference to a location in a second one of the components, the second one of the components preceding the first one of the components in the first order; and arrange the components into a predetermined second order to produce a reordered software module so that the second one of the components is subsequent to the first one of the components in the second order, wherein the arrangement is based on a type of the first and second ones of the components, wherein the components include at least one of a header, a section, and a table, wherein the reordered software module includes at least one reference from a third component to a preceding component, and wherein the at least one reference from the third component is stored in a memory to avoid a nonsequential reading of the reordered software module.”

The Applicant respectfully submits that Levine does not disclose or suggest a “instructions operable to... arrange the components into a predetermined second order to produce a reordered software module so that the second one of the components is subsequent to the first one of the components in the second order, wherein the arrangement is based on a type of the first and second ones of the components,” as recited in claim 55, for the reasons discussed

above with reference to claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn. Because claims 56-60 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 55, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.


Claim 42 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Levine as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,185,733 to Breslau et al. (hereinafter "Breslau"). (See 12/31/08 Office Action, p. 9.) The Applicant respectfully submits that Breslau does not cure the deficiencies of Levine discussed above with reference to claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 25, 2009

By: 
Michael J. Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, New York 10038
Tel.: (212) 619-6000
Fax: (212) 619-0276